



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,272	03/10/2004	Brian S. Higgins	7340-010	2948
4678	7590	02/08/2011	EXAMINER	
MACCORD MASON PLLC			RINEHART, KENNETH	
300 N. GREENE STREET, SUITE 1600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P. O. BOX 2974				3743
GREENSBORO, NC 27402			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/08/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/797,272 <b>Examiner</b> KENNETH B. RINEHART	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HIGGINS, BRIAN S. <b>Art Unit</b> 3743
<i>-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -</i>		
THE REPLY FILED 03 January 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.		
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.            b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<b>NOTICE OF APPEAL</b>		
<p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>		
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>		
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>		
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>		
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. </p>		
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>		
<p>7. <input type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.            Claim(s) objected to: _____.            Claim(s) rejected: _____.            Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. </p>		
<b>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</b>		
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>		
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>		
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>		
<b>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</b>		
<p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>see attached</u>.</p>		
<p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____</p>		
<p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>		
<p>/Kenneth B Rinehart/            Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3743</p>		

Regarding the applicant's arguments concerning the 35 USC 112 written description rejections, the applicant has failed to provide specific citations in the specification indicating where the claim limitations are found. Specifically, where is the discussion in the disclosure of the two to ten adjustments enumerated in the claims? Where is the discussion in the specification of adjustments to the ten or eleven parameters claimed to achieve a SO<sub>3</sub> concentration of less than 15 ppm? The specification discusses micro and macro staging and on page 9 there is a discussion of increasing residence time with several methods also dealing with increasing the reducing potential in the flue gases, but there is no discussion of the claim limitations. If such limitations were found in the specification, it should be any easy matter to identify these passages. Regarding the 112 enablement rejection, the applicant has failed to provide working examples involving the ten or eleven parameters. Certainly it would be helpful if the applicant had provided direction in the specification but the details needed to make and use the invention are lacking. The applicant has provided an affidavit but it merely discusses in generalities that one of ordinary skill in the art would know how to perform the eleven methods. For example, he states that one would know that distances between stages should be lengthened. However, this distance is never quantified. The affidavit also states that mixing can be increased by altering the OFA port locations, pressures, flows, port sizes or burner zone. However, these variables have not been quantified. Consequently, as a result of the breadth of the claims, the lack of direction and working examples, as well as a lack of predictability with this cutting edge technology, one of ordinary skill would require undue experimentation. Regarding the applicant's arguments that the references lack the at least two adjustments, as outlined in the rejection the references and the AAPA clearly disclose or teach these adjustments.